UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,954	06/29/2001	Lyle S. Corbin	150748.01	8107

22971 7590 06/13/2008
MICROSOFT CORPORATION
ONE MICROSOFT WAY
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/895,954	CORBIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DUSTIN NGUYEN	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 March 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,12-24,42,43 and 46-63* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-8,12-24,42,43 and 46-63* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42, 43 and 46-63 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6-8, 12-15, 17-20, 42, 43, 46-48, 53, 55-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. [US Patent No 6,842,898], in view of Torii [US Patent No 6,389,446].

4. As per claim 1, Carlson discloses the invention as claimed including a method for accessing status information related to a process [i.e. monitoring a plurality of related threads] [Abstract; and col 1, lines 10-15] the method comprising:

receiving a request from a client for status information related to the process [i.e. GUI for interact with user] [308, Figure 3; col 6, lines 29-43; and col 7, lines 23-28];

storing the status information in a data structure [i.e. status information is stored in string data] [col 5, lines 44-46; and col 10, lines 30-50]; and

enabling the client to access the status information [i.e. print dialogues are employed to receive user input] [Figure 4; and col 7, lines 24-33].

Carlson does not specifically disclose

identifying nodes in a network, each of the nodes executing a distributed thread of the process;

polling each identified node for status information associated with the thread executing by the node; the status information generated by a script associated with the process;

receiving the status information from each of the nodes.

Torii discloses

identifying nodes in a network [i.e. sequencer assigns tasks to processing units] [6a-6d, Figure 3; 73, 74, Figure 23; and col 2, lines 1-14], each of the nodes executing a distributed thread of the process [i.e. each processing unit is assigned to a task] [74, Figure 23; col 1, lines 22-33; and col 2, lines 1-14];

polling each identified node for status information associated with the thread executing by the node [i.e. search for "free-state" thread processor and update thread status table] [col 6, lines 64-col 7, lines 18]; the status information generated by a script associated with the process [i.e. obtain the status by preparing a instruction for getting to know the status] [col 11, lines 61-63];

receiving the status information from each of the nodes [i.e. update thread status table for thread processors] [Figures 4 and 21; and col 6, lines 14-25].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Carlson and Torii because the teaching of Torii on distributed threads

would provide a system and method for lowering thread scheduling cost by divide a program into the instruction streams and multiple-processor system executing a plurality of threads of instruction streams [Torii, col 2, lines 51-61].

5. As per claim 6, Carlson discloses making the data structure available to any node in the network capable of accessing a process management system in a primary node [Figure 9; and col 10, lines 51-65].

6. As per claim 7, Torii discloses wherein the step of polling is performed by the process management system residing on the primary node over an established connection with the identified nodes [i.e. thread manager] [5, Figure 3; Figure 4; and col 6, lines 6-25].

7. As per claim 8, Torii discloses wherein the identified nodes include the primary node [Figures 3 and 23; col 2, lines 1-16; and col 6, lines 6-13].

8. As per claim 12, Carlson discloses wherein the step of storing is performed by a process management system executing on a primary node [Figure 5; and col 9, lines 15-18].

9. As per claim 13, Torii discloses wherein the step of storing further includes: placing the status information relative to the executable process into a private data structure by the process management system on the primary node [Figure 4; and col 14-25], wherein the private data

structure is accessible to only script threads that are spawned during the execution of the process [i.e. restriction] [Figure 16; and col 11, lines 45-56].

10. As per claim 14, Carlson discloses wherein the step of storing further includes: placing the status information relative to the executable process into a status value data structure that is accessible to any node capable of accessing the process management system executing on the primary node [i.e. public method] [col 5, lines 34-36; and col 9, lines 65-67].

11. As per claim 15, Carlson discloses wherein the status value data structure comprises data for providing an indication of an event that occurs during the execution of the process [col 10, lines 56-65].

12. As per claim 17, Carlson discloses establishing a connection between other client nodes and a process management system residing on a primary node, wherein the connection is established from a user interface executing on the other client nodes; and accessing the process management system from over the established connection by the user interface executing on the other client nodes [i.e. GUI] [308, Figure 3; and col 6, lines 29-43].

13. As per claim 18, Carlson discloses wherein the step of establishing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to establish a connection with the process management system executing on the primary node [i.e. interactive dialogue] [col 7, lines 27-33].

14. As per claim 19, Carlson discloses wherein the step of accessing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to invoke the action of the executable process by the process management system from over the established connection [col 6, lines 29-43; and col 7, lines 27-33].

15. As per claim 20, Carlson discloses wherein the step of accessing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to poll the process management system for status information from over the established connection [Abstract; and col 2, lines 29-37].

16. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 1.

17. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 17.

18. As per claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 18.

19. As per claim 47, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.

20. As per claim 48, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 20.

21. As per claim 53, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.

22. As per claim 55, Carlson discloses wherein the process management system receives requests to invoke the action of the executable process from the one or more nodes connected to the process management system [Figures 3 and 4].

23. As per claim 56, Carlson discloses wherein the process management system continuously polls the one or more nodes connected to the process management system to obtain status information related to the executable process [i.e. continuous update] [col 10, lines 9-11].

24. As per claims 57-60, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 13-15.

25. As per claim 61, Carlson discloses wherein the process management system receives requests for status information relative to the executable process from the one or more nodes connected to the process management system [Figures 3 and 4; and col 7, lines 23-59].

26. As per claim 62, Carlson discloses wherein the process management system sends the public data structure to the one or more nodes in response to the request [col 5, lines 34-36; and col 9, lines 65-67].

27. As per claim 63, Carlson discloses wherein the process management system sends the status value data structure to the one or more nodes in response to the request [col 6, lines 43-col 7, lines 17].

28. Claims 3-5, 16, 21-24, 49-52, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carlson et al. [US Patent No 6,842,898], in view of Torii [US Patent No 6,389,446], and further in view of Chinta et al. [US Patent No 6,879,995].

29. As per claim 3, Carlson and Torii do not specifically disclose invoking one or more script engines to execute at least one script code that performs at least one action of the process; handling multiple script threads during the execution of the process. Chinta discloses invoking one or more script engines to execute at least one script code that performs at least one action of the process [i.e. JSP engines] [col 22, lines 1-46]; handling multiple script threads during the execution of the process [i.e. multi-threading] [Figure 4; and col 10, lines 42-55]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Carlson, Torii and Chinta because the teaching of Chinta of scripting would provide a means for enabling programs or program components that are referenced via a URL to run on a separate computer from the web server and to persist between client invocations [Chinta, col 1, lines 47-51].

30. As per claim 4, Chinta discloses wherein the one or more script engines are maintained by a process management system that executes on the nodes [i.e. application server] [Figure 3; and col 9, lines 42-67].

31. As per claim 5, Chinta discloses wherein the one or more nodes include a primary node [Figures 5 and 6; and col 12, lines 1-28].

32. As per claim 16, Carlson discloses establishing a connection between a process management system executing on at least one of the nodes and another process management system residing on a primary node [col 6, lines 43-col 7, lines 17]. Carlson and Torii do not specifically disclose wherein the connection is established by a script code in execution by a script engine associated with the at least one node. Chinta discloses wherein the connection is established by a script code in execution by a script engine associated with the at least one node [col 22, lines 1-22]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Carlson, Torii and Chinta because the teaching of Chinta of scripting would provide a means for enabling programs or program components that are referenced via a URL to run on a separate computer from the web server and to persist between client invocations [Chinta, col 1, lines 47-51].

33. As per claim 21, Chinta discloses wherein the user interface receives messages from the process management system over the established connection [Abstract; and col 5, lines 32-43].

34. As per claim 22, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain information that is descriptive of the primary node [col 17, lines 2-12].

35. As per claim 23, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain information that is descriptive of a particular event that occurs during the execution of the process [i.e. determine the current status of the request] [col 17, lines 18-27].

36. As per claim 24, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain a data structure that is generated as a result of the execution of the script code by the one or more script engines to indicate the status of the executable process [i.e. UDP status message] [col 17, lines 2-12].

37. As per claims 49-52, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 21-24.

38. As per claim 54, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

39. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42, 43 and 46-63 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

40. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Dustin Nguyen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2154